

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/705,903	11/13/2003	Joseph D. Tobiason	117275	7310	
25944 73	590 12/19/2005		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & BEI P.O. BOX 1992	RRIDGE, PLC		RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO		
ALEXANDRIA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2828		

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A	\mathcal{V}
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
	10/705,903	TOBIASON ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ	2828	
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communi - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATOR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply cation. Dry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS, by statute, cause the application to become ABANI	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. FONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on .		
	☐ This action is non-final.	·	
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for		prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice		•	
Disposition of Claims		•	
4) Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-10 and 12-21</u> is/are rejected to claim(s) <u>11,22 and 23</u> is/are objected to solution are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration. I. o.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by t	he Examiner.	٠
Applicant may not request that any objection	n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do copies of the priority do some * c). Copies of the priority do some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do some * copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for the international * copies of the certified copies of the certified copies of the application from the international * copies of the attached detailed Office action for the international * copies of the certified copies of the priority do copies of the certified copies of the priority do copies of the certified copies	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in Appli the priority documents have been rec Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sumr		
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/29/2005, 2/2/04 		nil Date Tal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-10, 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zorabedian (US 6,108,355) in view of Katagiri et al (US 6,157,025).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18,

Zorabedian illustrates in figure 1A an external cavity laser having a laser (102), a reflector (122), a lens system (164), a quarter wave plates/optical retarders (112-114) [applicant's isolation element] an etalon filter (162) [applicant's transmission filter] including a wedge shaped corrective element (120) [applicant's compensation prism], column 4 lines 8-10, discloses tuning of the cavity by translation of the wedge shaped

Art Unit: 2828

filter and in column 4 lines 59-63, discloses cascading the corrective element with the filter to vary the cavity length in synchronism with the filtered wavelength. Column 3 lines 44-46 discloses the etalon as a wedge air gap.

Zorabedian does disclose translating the wedge shaped filter but is silent as to the rotation of the filter.

Katagiri et al illustrates in figure 2 a tunable optical filter (15) including a substrate (14) coupled to a rotation mechanism (13) [applicant's rotary motor] for rotation of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotation mechanism of Katagiri et al with the wedge filter system of Zorabedian because it will provide a high speed wavelength discrimination in a optical communication system, column 1 lines 6-9 of Katagiri et al.

Regarding claims 2 and 3,

Zorabedian does disclose varying linearly the wavelength of the filter, column 4 lines 8-16 and the thickness of the corrective element, as illustrated in figure 1A.

Regarding claim 4,

Zorabedian does not disclose the filter having a wavelength cycles around a track.

Katagiri et al illustrates in figure 7 the optical filter including a track control concentric with the axis of rotation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotating filter of Katagiri et al with the laser

Art Unit: 2828

system of Zorabedian because it will provide a high speed wavelength discrimination in a optical communication system, column 1 lines 6-9 of Katagiri et al.

Regarding claims 5 and 8,

Zorabedian does disclose a corrective element with varying thickness but is silent as to rotation of the filter for providing of thickness cycles.

Katagiri et al illustrates in figure 2 a tunable optical filter (15) including a substrate (14) coupled to a rotation mechanism (13) for rotation of the filter.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotation mechanism of Katagiri et al with the wedge filter system of Zorabedian because it will provide thickness cycles and high speed wavelength discrimination in a optical communication system, column 1 lines 6-9 of Katagiri et al.

Regarding claims 6 and 16,

Zorabedian discloses in column 4 lines 23-25 the tuner (160) having wavelength feedback [applicant's trigger feature].

Regarding claim 7,

Zorabedian does not disclose the filter having multiple transmission wavelength cycles.

Katagiri et al illustrates in figure 7 the optical filter including first and second filter layers (15A) and (15B) parallel to each other.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rotating filter of Katagiri et al with the laser Art Unit: 2828

system of Zorabedian because it will provide a high speed wavelength discrimination in a optical communication system, column 1 lines 6-9 of Katagiri et al.

Regarding claims 19-21,

Zorabedian does disclose preventing mode hopping, see column 4 lines 38-46.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11, 22 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ whose telephone number is 571-272-1952. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MINSUN HARVEY can be reached on 571-272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2828

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ÁRMÁNDO RODRIGUEZ

Page 6

Examiner Art Unit 2828

AR